

March 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H2881

thing, and Jane is one of the richest women in America. You aren't going to say a word. You are just going to give her the money.

Mr. BALL. I think the question is simply whether you want to operate on presumptions under social insurance.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I want to operate fairly. If I pay into the system, I want to have the same right to draw that anybody else has. I don't consider this a welfare program. Most people are relying upon this for pensions. The only possible excuse you could have on the cases I have given is go into court and say that it was welfare.

Now, of course it is not welfare because you are giving it to people that don't need it, except that you are not giving it if it is a husband that does need it.

Now, I would like to ask you if a man works at two jobs, moonlights, do you add his combined earnings together so he can draw?

Mr. BALL. Up to the maximum allowable in the particular year.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. You do?

Mr. BALL. If the two combined are more than the maximum earnings base, then they are limited to that \$6600.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that a moonlighting man can add his contributions up to \$6,600 and draw on that base. In addition if he has paid on more than \$6,600 he can take the additional tax he has paid as a credit on his income tax. But if a husband and wife each pay on a \$6,600 base, the money is accepted and there is no rebate on taxes. In addition, each of them can draw only once as a beneficiary. But if the husband and wife together pay on \$6,600, they are not permitted to add their credits, but may draw only on the highest paying job as a husband and wife, or may each draw on his own, whichever is more. If a working husband and wife were given the same rights as a working husband, they could combine the taxes they pay and receive a credit for any overpayment; or at least each could draw as a worker and give the other one-half his benefit.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But you combine his earnings. You told me just before this hearing started that you would be quite incompetent to add a husband's and wife's earnings together.

Why can't you add theirs?

Mr. HALL. I think there are a lot of technical difficulties, Mrs. Griffiths. I wouldn't want to say at this point that they are inseparable. What I indicated was that we had found no leeway to do it because of situations where there are divorces, separations.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. What difference would it make? If they are divorced they are going to draw on their combined earnings; only if they are married.

Mr. BALL. But is it only during the years in which they are married that you make the combination?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. That's right, only the years in which they are drawing. If they both work add the earnings together. If they get divorced after they begin to draw, each one takes his own.

Mr. BALL. I say some of the difficulties that we see, for example, are the individual retires at 65. The woman has a wage record that has extended since she was 20. She married at 30 and was with this particular husband for 10 or 15 years and then perhaps another husband for 10 or 15 years, and then maybe there was a separation.

I find it difficult to know exactly which years I add together.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. When they began to draw add the combined earnings of that husband and wife.

Mr. BALL. Regardless of whether she was—

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Married to him or not.

Mr. BALL. Whether he was married to her or not.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Living in sin. You take care of lots of problems in Miami right now.

Mr. BALL. We took care of that last year, Mrs. Griffiths.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. You didn't take care of it very well.

Mr. BALL. I see a considerable amount of merit, as you have suggested, in the idea that a husband and wife together should have a benefit related to the level of earnings that they have had.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Right.

Mr. BALL. I find it more difficult to follow the reasoning of adding together the earnings while she was not his wife at some earlier point and filling out his wage record at another time. That is not what the two of them were living on.

You are not replacing the earnings that they have had as a couple.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. You are replacing the earnings that this couple had.

Mr. BALL. I could see adding them together while they are a couple. The difficulty I get in is—

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I don't think you would have any problem at all, Mr. Ball. How much does it cost you every year to keep account of the credits? Doesn't it cost you about half a billion dollars?

Mr. BALL. No.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. How much?

Mr. BALL. On the administrative cost of maintaining the earnings record I would have to supply the exact figure for the record, but I would think it would be nearer \$100 million.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. If they are not really of any effect, if those credits mean nothing, why not just fire that group of people, ask those who want Social Security to supply the records of their tax payments for the last five years, and you could use the \$100 million to send out to recipients?

Mr. BALL. It seems to me that the wage record far from meaning nothing, is the entire basis of eligibility and benefit amounts under the program.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Let me ask you this. This is one of the things that is really so illogical to me. You paid in up through 1962 and in 1962 you are 60 years of age. You decide for reasons known to yourself that you believe now that you have enough money. You will just wait and you will start drawing when you are 65.

Next door to you lives a person who has worked for Civil Service until he was 55. He too will be 65 in 1967. He gets a job in covered employment, works for ten years in covered employment, and pays in at the top rate. Which one of those two people gets the more money in their retirement?

Mr. BALL. The person who has paid in the longer would get more money, Mrs. Griffiths. The fact that the civil servant that you spoke of was fully insured by reason of paying in ten years guarantees him really only the entitlement to some level of benefits, but the way the program is constructed the average monthly earnings determines the amount of benefit and to arrive at the average monthly earnings you have to count everything after 1950 except for five years of low earnings and then divide it by the total number of months that have elapsed.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I checked with one of your offices and I believe I was told that the person who had paid in all those years, and wives too, would draw \$1.30 less a month than a man who paid the last ten years.

Mr. BALL. They may have not have gotten all the facts in your example. There are situations in the early years of the program where an individual can pay in for a shorter period and by the situation of earning higher amounts for a short period get more in benefits. That is quite true.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. The real truth is the payment in Social Security is not based on what you pay in, but it is wage related, isn't it?

Mr. BALL. You are correct that the benefit amounts are related to the wages, but the contributions over time and in the system as it develops in the long run are also related to the wages.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Now, you are coming in asking for an enormously increased wage base. Why don't you now make this more related to the years of payments into the system in place of the wages you drew in the final years in which you paid in?

For instance, in Detroit many men worked at Packard Motor Car at a high wage and they worked there until they were in their late 40's. When they left Packard, when Packard closed, many of those people have never again drawn more than the minimum wage.

Now, in spite of the fact that they paid in all of their working life some of those people are going to be stuck with much lower income than people who paid in only ten years.

Mr. BALL. I think very fundamentally, Mrs. Griffiths, both the Social Security program and private pension plans by and large have operated on the theory that their function was best served by paying a benefit that was related to the amount that people have had to live on and that the strict relationship of the benefit to the exact contributions of an individual is perhaps more appropriate to individually bought annuities or individual types of insurance.

Now, the relationship, however, in most instances and over time is still quite close. You relate the benefits to earnings that people have had and they pay on those earnings, so there is a relationship between the benefit and the payment, but, as you point out, there are situations in which an individual may have paid in for quite a while and then for a long period of time earns much less.

It is true that the benefit as a replacement of what he has been living on and what he is earning may in some instances be lower than it would be if you developed the system as it was in 1935, say, where it was much more closely related just to contributions, but not to the earnings level.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Now, I would like to ask you how much money do you get back from widows who return to work? How much is paid in as taxes? I mean how much is their Social Security cut? How many of them are having their Social Security cut because they have gone to work?

Mr. BALL. Do you have a figure on that? We are paying currently about—

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. A million?

Mr. BALL. About a half million widows. You are speaking of the under age 62?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. You told Joint Economic that you were paying a million women with children and that 300,000 of those women did work.

Mr. BALL. A million were eligible?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. How much money do you get back from them? How much does it cut the Social Security payment?

Mr. BALL. Mr. Myers is looking up something on that. While he is doing that perhaps I could state what I understand the question to be for the record, and that is that we are speaking here of the widows who get benefits by reason of having young children in their care, not the over age 60?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes.

Mr. BALL. And the situation is that we are paying about a million of them, but the question is how many would we be paying except for the requirement that they not be performing substantial work?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. The question is how many of them work and therefore cut the Social Security payment?

Mr. MYERS. Mrs. Griffiths, the approximate number of women who would other-

H2882

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 16, 1967

wise be receiving mothers' insurance benefits because of having children in their care, who work substantially and therefore do not receive benefits is, as we have said before, about 300,000 and the annual benefit reduction as a result of that is around \$250 million a year.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, I would like to say that I personally feel that it is a great error to charge these women anything, to reduce it at all.

You have about 700,000 women left that you are paying. Is that not true?

Mr. BALL. I don't believe it is that high. It is about 500,000.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I ran a little check. If they went to work at \$3600, which you told me was a mean average wage for women, and they had two children, you would charge them \$189 income tax.

She would pay \$189 income tax. She would pay \$158.40 Social Security. Then she would lose in Social Security \$1296.

So that in order for her to go to work and earn \$3600 she has to pay \$1632.40, which would leave her a net gain of \$1966.60 if she didn't have to buy any clothes, lunches and transportation to and from work.

My personal opinion is that a large part of these women who are asking now please reduce the age to 50 are women that have been maintained and really kept from working because of this tremendous payment they have to make.

Now, I don't think we are getting any place doing this. I think you just might as well pay them and let them go to work. You are going to collect taxes off them, anyhow. I don't understand why you consider that their earnings. That is the contribution in place of the husband's earnings. And when that woman starts to work you don't say to her, "Well, Madam, you don't have to pay at all. Your husband paid."

So why do you want to take some money away from her? This is a carry over from the worker, isn't it? If the worker were drawing Social Security you wouldn't let him work, but why not let the widow work?

Mr. BALL. I think, Mrs. Griffiths, the reasoning is much the same as the so-called retirement test—

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. That is right.

Mr. BALL.—for the older persons themselves, and the assumption is that the payment is made to the widow to partly make up for a loss that she suffered.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But why pay her to stay out of the job market?

Mr. BALL. If she demonstrates that on her own she supports herself through work, there isn't the same loss of support there and the same need to make the Social Security payment. I would be somewhat concerned, if the so-called retirement test were dropped for a particular category of beneficiaries, that it would be a logical step to extend it to other categories with the very great cost that we have talked about many times that is involved.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. In my judgment, the test wasn't logical when applied to her. There was the illogic of the whole thing. She is not her husband. They are two different people, and if they were going to work you would collect Social Security taxes from both of them, so why do you want to penalize this woman?

Now, I might ask in that connection even if the woman who dies is currently insured and the husband is totally dependent upon her, you don't pay him any money, do you?

Does he get any money?

Mr. BALL. Oh, you are speaking as if he were young?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes.

Mr. BALL. No, you are correct.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. He doesn't get a cent.

Mr. BALL. We do if he is 63 or course.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But he doesn't get any money at all.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. So it is another situation where the wife's contribution just isn't worth what the husband's contribution is.

Mr. BALL. The children would be paid.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But not the husband.

Mr. BALL. But not the husband, you are correct.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Secretary, I don't mind being second class as a citizen, but I certainly do hate to see my husband second class.

CHALLENGE OF THE SEVEN SEAS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a television program which I think will be of interest and value.

"Challenge of the Seven Seas," a highly informative book written by my friend Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, will be the topic of discussion on the "Georgetown University Forum," Sunday.

The distinguished panel for the program includes Senator PELL, Harold Leland Goodwin, the coauthor of "Challenge of the Seven Seas" and Rear Adm. Odale D. Waters, Jr., the oceanographer of the Navy. All are versed on the subject of marine science and oceanography and should provide new insights into the matter for all viewers.

I have found Senator PELL's book most enlightening and feel that my colleagues will also gain greatly from this show.

In the Washington area, channel 4, WRC-TV will carry the program beginning at noon. It is also scheduled for WETA-TV, channel 26, on Monday at 10 p.m.

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

B-1 E-1
TRADING WITH RUSSIA: FIAT-SOVIET AUTOMOBILE PLANT

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. Wolff) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, since 1961 the Fiat automobile manufacturing company of Italy has been dealing with Soviet Russia with a view to building in Russia an automobile manufacturing plant which will quadruple the Russian capacity for building cars. Not long after these dealings began, the U.S. Government involved itself in arrangements for supplying important machine tools for the Fiat-Soviet automobile plant. American authorities are now asking the Congress to authorize the sale of these tools, admittedly the best in the world, to Italy for resale to Soviet Russia.

Our experts contend that we will not sell strategic materials to Soviet Russia, but the result of the Fiat-Soviet automobile deal will be the same thing. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are making extremely good use of bicycles as means of transport in Vietnam today. What better use could they make of a fleet of Fiat automobiles supplied to them by the Russians as a means of conveyance for materials, supplies, and possibly troops to our other enemy North Vietnam?

Why should the North Vietnamese and Vietcong bargain for an end to the war, when American aid is possibly on its way either directly or indirectly through such avenues as the Fiat-Soviet automobile deal, food for India, and M-16 rifles for Singapore?

The administration apparently is deluded into thinking that such actions as supplying important components for an automobile factory in Soviet Russia is a matter unconnected with the aggression of the Communists in southeast Asia. Such thinking is not only naive, it is dangerous.

It is difficult enough for the American people to swallow the Government's continued indifferent attitude toward our so-called friends and allies trading with North Vietnam and other Communist bloc nations. Dealing with our enemies, even though it is claimed to be nonstrategic and through a neutral party, will stick in the craw of every American worthy of the name.

Moreover, the attitude of Italy, a nation which the United States raised up out of the ashes of defeat and degradation when she richly deserved that defeat, is also a matter which the American people will resent. Is this insult to be added to the injury of Italy trading blatantly with the North Vietnamese?

How long must America suffer such indignities? How long must America be the patsy in the international community? How long must America go easy with friends as well as enemies before we wake up to our responsibilities to world freedom and independence?

March 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2883

We see on the one hand the administration dispatching our young men into the gristmill of war for the honorable and humanitarian purpose of defending the weak against the threat of monolithic, ideological totalitarianism. And on the other hand, we are asked to proceed blithely to trade with that threatening monolith, as though it were a armless, blameless neighbor, seeking merely the progress of its peaceful peoples. I cannot accept this double standard, and I shall not support it. Neither shall the American people accept it or support it once they know the truth.

I cannot condone the giving of our natural resources, either through economic aid or military aid, to those who trade directly or indirectly with our enemies North Vietnam, Russia, Communist China, and the other Communist nations—in this case Italy and Communist Russia. We have young men dying on the battlefields of Vietnam every day, fighting the North Vietnamese—communistic, political, ideological, and economic allies of Communist China and Communist Russia—trading and business allies of England, Italy, Canada, Communist China, and Communist Russia.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer will the American people tolerate this situation; how much longer can they?

REACTION TO PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION REPORT

(Mr. CASEY (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's National Crime Commission has pointed out that there are no easy answers to be found in the war against crime. But it has told us, in what are really most hopeful terms, that there are answers.

To find the solutions will not be easy, for they are as varied and complex as the nature of crime. However, the campaign must be won—for what is at stake is no less than our right to be free from domestic fear.

Every American must work to help control crime. Every town, and county, and municipality must work to improve their police departments and system of criminal justice.

The awareness of the problem is great, and the calls for action are many. One of the most eloquent assessments of the Commission's great contributions appeared recently in the Houston Post, and I place the editorial in the RECORD with my remarks:

CRIME CONTROL

Those Americans who are really interested in trying to do something about the nation's growing crime problem, including officials at all levels of government, should be grateful to President Johnson's special commission for a thoughtful and intelligent analysis of the problem. It has performed a service of great potential value.

The more than 200 recommendations made by the panel do not promise any quick or easy solution for the problem, because there is none. Crime, as a social problem, is to a very large extent the product of all the

other problems that afflict a social group. At the very least, it is linked with these problems. The idea that it can be isolated and dealt with separately in a free society is simply unrealistic.

It is not difficult to identify the factors that are contributing to the growth in crime. The question is what to do about them, and it was the assignment of the commission to offer suggestions. The value of its study will depend upon the use that is made of it and the extent to which its recommendations are implemented.

Most of this will have to be done at the state and local levels, since, constitutionally, the primary responsibility for combating crime rests there. The federal government can help. It can provide some of the money needed. It can provide leadership. It can cooperate. It can provide encouragement. It can undertake to stimulate action. But, in the end, state and local officials must do whatever needs to be done since most crime is not interstate. They can or will do no more than the people of each state and community demand and are willing to support.

"Controlling crime in America is an effort that will be slow and hard and costly. But America can control crime if it will," the panel said. Success, however, will take money, manpower, drastic reforms and "an unremitting national effort for social justice," the report added. As the chairman of the commission, Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, pointed out, part of the difficulty arises from the fact that efforts are being made to deal with the problem with machinery and methods that are out-moded and no longer adequate.

Ideas about law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice simply have not kept pace with the changes that have taken place in the way Americans live during recent years, under the impact of industrialization, urbanization, rapid technological and scientific progress and vastly increased mobility for all citizens.

If the idea is to control crime, to reduce the amount of crime, it is not enough to identify, arrest, prosecute and punish offenders. That is essential, of course, but if police-state methods are to be avoided, the primary emphasis must be on prevention, on trying to correct or control the forces and factors that produce crime. This may be costly, but a much higher cost may have to be paid in the end in one way or another if preventive efforts are inadequate.

Even with a maximum preventive effort, however, it is obvious that the present allocation of resources and present methods for dealing with crime after it is committed will continue to be inadequate if the allocation is not increased and the methods modernized. It is possible to have effective law enforcement and efficient administration of criminal justice if members of the social group, and especially those who would benefit from it most, are willing to pay for it in dollars and whatever else may be required.

GUN THUGS AVOID CRIMES WITH MANDATORY PENALTIES

(Mr. CASEY (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the thugs who use firearms to prey on society know the criminal law as well as any attorney.

They know which crimes carry stiff, mandatory penalties—and they avoid them like the plague.

Lets look at two instances:

Bank robbery can bring punishment

of anything from a suspended sentence up to 25 years, depending upon the leniency of the court, plus a possible fine of up to \$5,000.

Armed robbery of a post office brings a mandatory 25-year sentence.

Last year, there were 1,070 bank robberies, a 19-percent increase over the previous year.

There were only 66 post office robberies.

I say to my colleagues, what more evidence do we need before acting to make use or possession of a firearm during commission of crimes of violence punishable by a stiff, mandatory Federal sentence.

Surely, it should be obvious to all that the best deterrent to crime is swift, sure, and severe punishment. This is the main thrust of legislation I have authored pending before this Congress. Two bills, H.R. 360 and 6137, would make use or possession of firearms during commission of major crimes of violence punishable by a mandatory 10-year prison term on first offense, 25 years on any subsequent offense.

I say to my colleagues: Look closely at these two areas of crime.

Post offices are scattered throughout our land in isolated areas. They hold ready cash, stamps, and money order blanks. There are no armed guards. But these punks who use guns to rob know that if they hit a post office—they are subject to a flat 25-year mandatory prison term, while bank robbery can bring a lighter sentence. So last year, they used guns to rob 1,070 banks and savings and loan companies of \$4,428,000—and put thousands of innocent employees and depositors in terrible fear of their lives.

But they only robbed 66 post offices of \$46,933.

Chief Postal Inspector Henry Montague says the criminal knows full well the severe penalty for armed robbery of a post office.

The Post Office has always believed this a strong deterrent factor.

He said—and I certainly could not agree with him more.

While armed robbery of a post office carries a stiffer sentence than armed robbery of a bank—the situation is reversed on burglaries.

Penalty for burglarizing a post office can bring imprisonment for up to five years plus a fine of up to \$1,000.

But the penalty for burglarizing a bank can bring a stiff sentence of up to 20 years, and a fine of not more than \$5,000.

It is obvious the criminals know this, and crime statistics bear out this fact. Last year, there were 1,763 post office burglaries—and only 467 bank burglaries.

And yet—in the face of these facts showing that severe prison terms are a strong deterrent factor in crime prevention and enforcement—comes the cry from some to abolish them. And from the same crowd of idealists comes the cry that the answer to our Nation's gun problem is to enact severe restrictions that do little to strike at the criminal but mainly harass the law-abiding gun owner.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues:

Ask any banker—ask any teller of a savings and loan company who has looked down the deadly barrel of a gun held by a robber—and you will get the answer to our gun problem. They want vigorous prosecution, judges who show more concern for them than the man who wielded the gun, and stiff mandatory sentences for those who use firearms to rob, rape, assault, and murder.

The people are demanding action. Our streets are unsafe to walk, even in daylight, and only the foolhardy attempt it at night. Businessmen daily are robbed and murdered. Crime has become such a commonplace occurrence in our land, that even our daily newspapers now merely carry box scores on an inside page, giving only brief details of such violence.

This Congress can and must act to protect our people, and to end the national disgrace of illegal use of firearms. This is the problem. It is not caused by the 20 million sportsmen who bought hunting licenses last year, or the many legitimate gun dealers, gunsmiths, the thousands employed in our domestic firearms industry, or the millions of Americans who keep guns in their homes to protect themselves and their loved ones.

The answer is simple—strike at the criminal.

Make the penalty for gun crimes so severe—and so certain through mandatory language—that the scum preying on society through a life of violence will soon find another form of larceny. But the violence—and the terror in our streets and in our business houses and our banks, will end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in the effort to make gun crimes a thing of the past.

Our people are demanding action—let us heed their cry, and have the courage to take the action needed.

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRADEMAS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRADEMAS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A LEGISLATIVE ARSENAL FOR OUR WAR AGAINST CRIME

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know of no domestic problem which is causing greater personal anxiety among Americans than our mounting crime rate.

For too long, discussion of the problem has been dominated by the dispute between those who berate the courts for their lenience and those who stanchly support them for their adherence to constitutional principles. In the course of this polarized dialog, many unfortunate and extreme statements have been made, most of the substantive issues were ignored, and little constructive or innovative thinking emerged.

As one who has often defended the courts in their decisions upholding the Bill of Rights, I feel particularly obligated at this point to speak out, from a different perspective, on the need to curb crime. On a purely statistical level, the figures alone are gravely disturbing. About 87 percent of the FBI's "Uniform Crime Reports Index" is made up of the three property crimes of burglary, automobile theft, and larceny of \$50 and over. Of the remaining 13 percent which are crimes of violence, more than half are committed, not by strangers passing in the night, but by those who are already known to each other as friends, acquaintances, spouses or family members. The mere numerical listing of index crimes in 1965 gives us some idea of the scope of the problem facing us: Murder and manslaughter, 9,850; forcible rape, 22,467; robbery, 118,916; aggravated assault, 206,661; burglary, 1,173,201; larceny of \$50 and over, 762,352; motor vehicle theft, 486,568. Stated another way, 2,422,121 crimes against property were committed and 357,894 against the person.

A comparison of these figures with those of 1933 shows that total numbers for all reported offenses have increased markedly. The number of offenses per 100,000 population has tripled for forcible rape and has doubled for aggravated assault. The willful homicide rate has decreased somewhat. Robbery has fluctuated from a high in 1933 and a low during World War II to a point where it is now about 20 percent above the beginning of the postwar era.

The rise in property crime rates is even sharper than that in crimes of violence. The rate for larcenies of \$50 and over is up more than 550 percent since 1933 and the burglary rate has nearly doubled.

Unfortunately, the upward trend has been accelerating: during the period 1960-65, violent crime increased 25 percent and property crimes 36 percent.

I do not cite these disturbing figures in order to add to the fear of our citizens, many of whom are afraid to travel the streets, especially at night, and complain of insufficient police protection. But I do think that the startling increase in the crime rate over the past 5 years indicates that the situation is becoming intolerable. It is time that we assigned especially high priority to our task of strengthening the resources and effectiveness of the police, courts, and correctional systems charged with frontline responsibility in our fight against crime.

There is no question that the roots of crime are deep and diverse. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recently

issued its report—an extraordinarily sensitive and knowledgeable survey of the entire subject—and concluded:

America must translate its well-founded alarm about crime into social action that will prevent crime.

The Commission tersely summarized the basic issues when it said:

The most significant action that can be taken against crime is action designed to eliminate slums and ghettos, to improve education, to provide jobs, to make sure that every American is given the opportunities and the freedoms that will enable him to assume his responsibilities. We will not have dealt effectively with crime until we have alleviated the conditions that stimulate it. To speak of controlling crime only in terms of the work of the police, the courts and the correctional apparatus, is to refuse to face the fact that widespread crime implies a widespread failure by society as a whole.

In addition to dealing with these underlying social and economic causes of crime, however, we are also forced to face the problem directly. Deeply concerned as I am with providing long-range solutions to our poverty, slums, and unemployment, I feel it is imperative that we also focus our attention on the necessity of taking immediate and concrete action to alleviate the anxieties of our citizens over the rising incidence of crime.

First of all, we must improve and strengthen our local police forces: they must attract more and higher caliber recruits; they must be more efficiently organized; they must be supplied with the most up-to-date equipment and technology. Secondly, we must expand our activities in the field of criminal research: we must give public and private support to both national and regional research institutes; we must channel our highly developed technology into the service of more scientific police investigation and effectiveness. Thirdly, we must make some serious commitment to controlling the indiscriminate sale and possession of firearms that make possible much of the criminal violence in our country.

After studying these problems, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the message, recently submitted by the President, dealing with the different facets of this problem provides a broad, effective and humane approach. I am pleased to introduce today, as a cosponsor, the President's Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967.

First, this legislation would establish a new Office of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance within the Department of Justice. The new Office and its Director would administer the act's grant programs and would serve as the connecting link with State and local agencies of criminal justice.

Long-range planning for growth and improvement of our State and local systems of criminal justice has long been neglected. This bill would provide Federal grants to States, cities, and regional and metropolitan bodies on a 90-10 matching basis, to assist them to develop plans for improving their police, courts, and correctional systems. Since local communities have been forced in the past to expend all their limited resources on